



Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1104

August 22, 1960

U.S. DELEGATION TO CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT SUBMITS REPORT TO SECRETARY HERTER	267
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AS A COOPERATIVE EFFORT OF THE FREE WORLD • <i>Excerpt From Report to the Congress</i>	289
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS: THE BOUNDARIES OF ACTION, GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE • <i>by Robert H. Thayer</i>	278
PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY	296
POLITICAL DIVISIONS OF AFRICA (with map) . . .	283

CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY

AUG 29 1960

DOCUMENTS SECTION X

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIII, No. 1104 • PUBLICATION 7054

August 22, 1960

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

U.S. Delegation to Conference on Disarmament Submits Report to Secretary Herter

The Department of State made public on August 6 (press release 430 dated August 5) the following official report of the U.S. delegation to the Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, held at Geneva March 15-June 28, 1960, which was submitted to the Secretary of State by Fredrick M. Eaton, chairman of the U.S. delegation.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE TEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

I. BACKGROUND

The Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament held 48 sessions in Geneva between March 15, 1960 and June 28, 1960. The committee recessed between April 29 and June 7.

The committee originated as a result of an initiative of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and USSR. The Foreign Ministers of these countries, in a communique of September 7, 1959, declared that:

As was announced on August 5, 1959, prior to the closing of the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva, the Foreign Ministers of the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics discussed possibilities by which further negotiations on the question of disarmament could be most effectively advanced.¹ Agreement has now been reached among the Governments of the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to set up a committee to consider disarmament matters. Understanding has also been

reached that the participants in the disarmament committee will be the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland, and Rumania, subject to the agreement of all the named states.

The United Nations Charter recognizes that disarmament matters are of world-wide interest and concern. Accordingly ultimate responsibility for general disarmament measures rests with the United Nations. The setting up of the disarmament committee in no way diminishes or encroaches upon the United Nations' responsibilities in this field. In setting up the committee the special responsibility resting on the great powers to find a basis for agreement is taken into account.

The four governments conceive of this committee as a useful means of exploring through mutual consultations avenues of possible progress toward such agreements and recommendations on the limitation and reduction of all types of armaments and armed forces under effective international control as may, in the first instance, be of particular relevance to the countries participating in these deliberations. Furthermore, it is the hope of the four governments that the results achieved in these deliberations will provide a useful basis for the consideration of disarmament in the United Nations.

It is the intention of the four governments that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be kept appropriately informed of the progress of the deliberations of the committee. For this purpose the four governments have agreed that the committee will present reports on its work to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and through it to the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. As a first step in this direction, they have requested the Secretary General, in accordance with Resolution 1252-D (XIII), to convene the Disarmament Commission during September 1959 if feasible, in order that the members may be fully informed of the nature and purpose of the disarmament committee.

The four governments will consult with the United Nations Secretary General with respect to providing appropriate facilities to the newly established committee. They expect that the committee will begin its work early in 1960 in Geneva.

¹ For text of a Four Power declaration on disarmament, see BULLETIN of Aug. 24, 1959, p. 269.

The General Assembly on November 20, 1959, adopted Resolution 1378 (XIV),² in which it called upon governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. The same resolution requested the Secretary General to make available to the ten-nation committee for thorough consideration the U.K. declaration of September 17, 1959, the Soviet declaration of September 18, 1959³ and other proposals or suggestions made, as well as the records of the plenary meetings and the meetings of the First Committee at which the question of general and complete disarmament was discussed. The General Assembly also expressed the hope in this Resolution that "measures leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time."

II. THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

A. Before the Recess of April 29

At the opening session of the conference on March 15th the Soviet bloc renewed its support of the plan presented by Chairman Khrushchev to the United Nations General Assembly on September 18, 1959.

The plan called for complete and general disarmament to be carried out, within a four-year period, in three stages. Stage one proposed significant reductions in the field of conventional armaments and armed forces. The second stage called for the complete disbandment of all remaining armed forces and the elimination of all foreign military bases. The final stage proposed the total elimination and/or destruction of all means of waging war, including abolition of all military institutions, courses and organizations.

The Allied plan was formally submitted at the second session of the Conference.⁴ As an ultimate goal the preamble of the plan looked toward a secure, free and peaceful world disarmed under

effective international control where disputes would be settled in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. To attain this objective the plan proposed three stages. The first and second stages detailed specific measures of disarmament which, in the first instance, would serve to stabilize the existing military environment. These two stages set forth basic measures to: guard against surprise attack or accidental war; halt future production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; reduce existing nuclear weapons stockpiles; bring about beginning balanced reductions in conventional arms and armed forces and initiate steps toward assuring the peaceful use of outer space. The third or final stage outlined far-reaching measures of disarmament. These aimed at the elimination of armaments to levels required only for internal security purposes and the build-up of an international enforcement system backed by universally accepted rules of law.

During the first three weeks of the negotiations each side probed the position of the other side.

The Soviet bloc, in asking the Allied powers to elaborate on their program, argued that the Allied plan did not provide for the total elimination of all means of warfare and did not embody concrete measures which, within a fixed time period, would lead to general and complete disarmament. They claimed that it was not responsive to Resolution 1378 (XIV) of the United Nations General Assembly.

The Allies, in turn, noted that the Soviet bloc while having stated its willingness to embark upon a program of complete and general disarmament, omitted any reference to specific measures by which this objective could be reached; its plan had unrealistic time limits and avoided concrete measures in the early stages. In particular, the Allies cited the fact that it detailed no specific measures which would lead to the first essential requirement—that of halting the arms race and securing a generally stable military situation.

Midway through the conference's first round, it became apparent that neither side was prepared materially to change its basic position.

At this juncture, the Soviet bloc took a new tack. On April 8, the Soviet representative tabled, ostensibly to find a way out of the apparent stalemate, a document entitled "Basic Principles of General and Complete Disarmament"

² For text, see *ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1959, p. 766.

³ For text, see U.N. doc. A/4219.

⁴ For text of a working paper on general disarmament released by Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States, together with texts of a statement made by Ambassador Eaton at the opening session of the Conference and President Eisenhower's letter of Mar. 12, 1960, to Mr. Eaton, see BULLETIN of Apr. 4, 1960, p. 511.

This stated that general and complete disarmament should: include the disbanding of all armaments and armed forces; be achieved in a sequence of three stages within four years; be implemented under international control; result in states having only internal security forces of an agreed size; and not be interrupted by any condition not covered in the treaty. In addition, a so-called "concrete measure" was proposed. To back up an agreement on principles by a deed, the bloc suggested that states possessing nuclear weapons should "solemnly declare" that they would not be the first to use them.

The Soviet bloc's "General principles" document was a step backward rather than a step forward. It was nothing more than a rephrased version of objectives contained in the Khrushchev plan. As to the proposed measure of renouncing first use of nuclear weapons, the West's view was that uncontrolled paper proclamations of intent which in no way would assure world stability or security were unacceptable.

At this point, the conference seemed to be stymied. In an effort to break the apparent deadlock, the Allies, on April 26, presented to the conference a "statement on conditions" for disarmament. It was hoped that such a statement would overcome the intransigence on the Communist side and permit negotiations to proceed on specific measures.

The statement declared that the disarmament process and any agreement finally reached must fulfill the following conditions: disarmament must be carried out in stages and as rapidly as possible, but with no fixed timetable; nuclear and conventional measures must be balanced in the interest of equal security for all countries; disarmament measures must be effectively controlled to ensure full compliance; and disarmament measures must be negotiated progressively according to the possibility of their early implementation and effective control. The statement concluded that the final goal of a program of general and complete disarmament under effective international control must be to achieve the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and the reduction and limitation of all types of forces and weapons to levels required only for internal security and the fulfillment of obligations under the U.N. Charter.

While the Communist countries did not spe-

cifically reject the Western paper, their reaction offered no encouragement to the Allied hope that the conference could turn toward a discussion of specific measures.

The conference recessed on April 29 in anticipation of the meeting of Heads of Government.

At the last session the Soviet bloc reiterated its determination to seek, as the first prerequisite of the conference, agreement on general principles for complete and total disarmament.

For its part, the West made it quite clear that unless and until the Soviet bloc was prepared to negotiate and agree on a number of specific disarmament measures, the conference's prospects for success were dim.

The Allies had hoped that through general probing this first round would indicate possible areas of common interest for negotiation. This unfortunately was not the case.

B. After the Conference Reconvened on June 7

Upon the resumption of the conference on June 7, the Soviet Delegation submitted the paper, Basic Clauses of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament, which had been transmitted by the Soviet Union to the Western governments on June 2,⁵ as well as to some 80 odd additional nations, and which revised the earlier Soviet proposals of September 18, 1959. The Soviet Delegation maintained that these new proposals represented an attempt to meet some of the views expressed by the Western Delegation prior to the recess.

The Soviet Delegation was told that the Western Delegations and their governments would carefully study the Soviet proposals in the hope that they might represent a serious desire to negotiate.

The work of the conference thereafter consisted primarily of two endeavors, first a renewed effort by the Western Delegations to have the Soviet and other Eastern European delegations discuss the concrete measures of disarmament as set forth in the Western proposals of March 16, and secondly attempts by the Western delegations to obtain clarifications regarding the new Soviet paper, in order to facilitate study of those proposals by Western governments.

Our efforts to get the Soviet delegation to dis-

⁵ For text of a U.S. reply to a Soviet note of June 2, see *ibid.*, June 27, 1960, p. 1018.

cuss specific practical measures of disarmament that would enable the world to make a start toward the goal of general and complete disarmament were unsuccessful. In spite of the fact that we invited the Soviet Delegation to choose any one of the measures in the March 16 paper as a basis for initial discussion, the Soviet Delegation persisted in refusing to discuss these proposals or the inspection requirements for each. The excuse used was to charge that the March 16 proposals were essentially proposals for control without significant measures of disarmament.

The Western effort to obtain clarification of the Soviet proposals of June 2 was made by a series of questions which were put to the Soviet Delegation. Only some of these questions were answered during the course of the discussions and the answers were unsatisfactory. The questions on control which were submitted by the French Delegation were answered evasively. The Soviet and other Eastern European delegations spent most of their time making propaganda speeches charging that the Western delegations were avoiding substantive responses to the new Soviet proposals and were displaying a negative and inflexible attitude.

In spite of the evasiveness of many Soviet answers to questions, it became clear that the new Soviet paper was primarily a change in format from the earlier September 18 proposals, and that most of the unrealistic and unacceptable concepts of that earlier document remained. Various changes which the Soviet Delegation maintained had been made in the September 18 paper in order to meet Western views proved in fact to be illusory or tied to impossible conditions.

Thus, for example, the Soviet Delegation maintained that moving a proposal for elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles from the last to the first stage of a disarmament program was in response to views expressed by the French Delegation, whereas in fact the Soviet proposal would have required the free world to commit itself as a first step to destroy within a matter of months its essential means of collective self-defense.

Similarly, the discussions showed that Soviet indication of a possible willingness to abandon its previous insistence on a four year time table for complete disarmament was merely the abandonment of this particular figure but not of the impractical principle upon which it is based, that a

fixed time table for the entire complex disarmament process must be agreed on before any steps can be taken to halt the arms race. As a corollary position the Soviet Union continued to insist that a time table for complex and radical disarmament measures be agreed to without the benefit of any joint studies to determine the problems or even feasibility of implementing each measure.

With regard to the critical question of control and inspection, there appeared to be little change in the Soviet position even though the Soviet paper of June 2 devoted more space to the subject than did the Soviet paper of September 18. The discussions showed that the Soviet Delegation was unwilling to accept even in principle that international inspectors would have the right to determine if clandestine installations existed in excess of agreed amounts; the Soviet position would limit the inspectors merely to counting those particular installations or forces that a government declared it was eliminating.

Finally, the responses made by the Soviet Delegation to some of the questions put to it made it apparent that a fundamental difference between positions remained. The position expressed by the Soviet Delegation was that the whole range of general and complete disarmament must be negotiated in detail in the Ten Nation Conference and then submitted to a world conference where all the nations of the world would have to approve a complex world-wide treaty before any actual measures to halt the arms race could be instituted. This approach would, of course, foredoom the world to endless discussion and no action could be taken to get the disarmament program started while negotiations were continuing on later stages.

The U.S. Delegation indicated to the Soviet Delegation the general nature of our concerns about the above indicated Soviet positions. The U.S. Delegation had also indicated in earlier meetings those elements of the June 2 paper which appeared to represent some slight movement toward a more rational approach to disarmament, such as the Soviet recognition, at least in principle, of the need to develop improved peace-keeping arrangements within the United Nations to assure the security of nations as national forces are progressively reduced, and the apparent recognition of the need to study at an early stage the arrangements necessary for the cessation of production of fissionable material for use in weapons.

Notwithstanding the serious and fundamental faults in the Soviet paper which the discussions in the conference had revealed, and despite the fact that the Soviet Delegation had refused to discuss the allied proposals of March 16, the U.S. Representative returned to Washington for consultations during the week of June 19. The Soviet Representative, Mr. [Valerian] Zorin, was informed by the U.S. Representative that he was returning to Washington to discuss the various views that had been presented during the discussions since the recess. During these Washington consultations a revised U.S. proposal was prepared. This new paper was based on the same sound basic principle of that of the Western proposals of March 16, namely, that we should proceed with earlier measures of disarmament and then discuss the details of later and more difficult stages of general and complete disarmament. The new U.S. paper did, however, clarify and amplify certain of the proposals put forth by the Western delegations on March 16 and it contained modifications which reflected views expressed by our allies and certain of those expressed by the Soviet Union. Thus, its purpose was to provide a fresh basis for advancing the negotiations.

The U.S. Representative informed Mr. Zorin before the meeting of June 27 that discussions in Washington had been fruitful and that the U.S. Delegation would table a new paper within the next few days, following consultations with allied delegations.

In the light of these facts, the subsequent action of the Soviet and other Eastern European delegations during the meeting of June 27 in withdrawing from the conference clearly demonstrated that their governments were not interested in serious negotiations but rather were concerned only with propaganda.

The action of the Polish Representative who was acting as Chairman of the meeting was unprecedented in the annals of international conferences. The Polish Representative refused to permit Western representatives who had been inscribed to speak the opportunity to make statements, recognizing only communist representatives. He then attempted the illegal procedure of declaring the meeting and conference ended. His departure from the room required the United Kingdom Representative to take the chair for the remainder of the meeting. The U.S. Delegation,

in view of the actions by the communist delegations, tabled the new U.S. paper (TNCD/7). It was not possible, of course, to present the paper as a Five Power document, since none of the Allied delegations had had time fully to consult with their governments.⁶

The Conference held one subsequent meeting on June 28 in order to give the communist delegations an opportunity to reconsider their arbitrary withdrawal. The communist delegations, however, did not attend the June 28 meeting. The Conference adopted the following communique at the end of the meeting:

The forty-eighth meeting of the Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament was held in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 28 June 1960, under the chairmanship of the representative of the United Kingdom.

The Conference requested the United Nations Secretariat to forward all records of the Conference to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and, through it, to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The Conference decided that the verbatim record of the forty-eighth meeting should be made public as soon as possible.

The Conference adjourned at 11:10 AM.

The United States Delegation, together with the delegations of Canada, France, Italy and the United Kingdom remained on in Geneva in order to be available in the event the governments of the communist delegations reconsidered their actions and decided to resume negotiations. The failure of the communist governments to return their delegations to the Ten Nation Conference, however, created a situation in which further useful work by the Conference was impossible.

The United States Delegation expresses its regret that the communist governments have, by their actions, prevented successful negotiations on disarmament. The importance to the world of the task of halting the arms race and of achieving balanced and staged disarmament remains unchanged by recent communist actions in the Conference.

It is important that the United States continue its efforts to seek safeguarded disarmament agreements that will reduce the danger of war and per-

⁶For text of the U.S. proposals, together with a Department statement and an exchange of communications between the U.S. and Soviet Governments regarding the termination of the Conference, see *ibid.*, July 18, 1960, p. 88.

mit the devotion of a greater portion of man's creative capacity to the construction of a better world for all peoples. It remains, however, for the communist governments, and particularly the Soviet Union, to decide that they are more interested in serious practical negotiation than in propaganda before this hope can be realized.

III. CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION

A. Secretariat

As a result of consultations with the Secretary General of the United Nations, all facilities and services for the conference were provided by the United Nations Secretariat under the direction of Dr. Dragan Protitch, who was present as the personal representative of the Secretary General.

B. Rules of Procedure

Prior to the first private meeting of the conference, agreement was reached on the following document (TNCD/INF. 1):

AGREEMENT ON PROCEDURAL ARRANGEMENTS

Agreement has been reached by the representatives of the ten Nations on the following matters. Modifications may be made by agreement of the ten Nations.

1. Nature of Meetings

All meetings will be private, except when agreed otherwise by the ten Nations.

2. Time of Meetings

There will normally be one meeting per day at 10:30 AM Mondays through Fridays. If experience proves that this time creates difficulties for any Delegation the matter may be raised again for further discussion.

3. Publicity and Communique

Publicity by or on behalf of the conference will be limited to the communique following each meeting. The draft communique will be prepared by the Chairman of the day and approved by the ten Nations. It will normally refer to the chairmanship of the meeting, any new documents tabled, agreements reached and the time of the next meeting. Delegations reserve the right to brief the press as regards their own positions.

4. Languages and Records

The languages of the conference will be English, French and Russian and there will be simultaneous interpretation into each of these languages. The right is reserved for delegations to request consecutive interpretation, but wherever possible advance notice of the request should be given to the Secretariat. Verbatim records will be furnished in the three languages.

5. Seating and Chairmanship

Delegations will be seated in English alphabetical order and the chair will be taken in rotation by the ten Delegations in English alphabetical order.

C. Agenda of the Conference

No formal agenda was proposed or agreed upon. In addition to the documents transmitted to the committee by General Assembly Resolution 1373 (XIV), the committee had before it the following documents tabled during its deliberations:⁷

Message of greetings from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, N. S. Khrushchev, to the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament. (TNCD/1 of 15 March 1960)

A message by President Eisenhower to Ambassador Eaton for the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament. (TNCD/2 of 15 March 1960)

A Plan for General and Comprehensive Disarmament in a Free and Peaceful World submitted by Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America on 16 March 1960 (TNCD/3 of 16 March 1960)

Proposal by the Delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Czechoslovakia, submitted to the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament on 8 April 1960 (TNCD/4 of 8 April 1960)

Proposal by the delegations of Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, concerning principles and conditions for general and complete disarmament under effective international control, submitted to the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament on 26 April 1960 (TNCD/5 of 26 April 1960)

Proposals by the Soviet Government submitted to the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament on 7 June 1960 (TNCD/6/Rev. 1 of 8 June 1960)

Program for General and Complete Disarmament under Effective International Control submitted by the delegation of the United States

⁷ Texts of the following documents, together with a list of members of delegations to the Conference (TNCD/INF. 3/Rev. 2), were appended to the report in press release 430.

Exchange of Correspondence Between President and Mr. Eaton

White House (Newport, R.I.) press release dated July 22

The White House on July 22 made public the following exchange of correspondence between the President and Fredrick M. Eaton, chairman of the American delegation to the Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva.

The President to Ambassador Eaton

JULY 20, 1960

DEAR MR. EATON: Upon the closing of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, I want you to know how deeply grateful I am to you for undertaking the Chairmanship and for your efforts to find an agreement which would halt the building up of armaments.

Your strong, courageous and imaginative leadership has been a source of pride to all of us who have been working with you. It was not due to any fault on the part of yourself and your associates that no agreement was reached. In any event you have made the United States position of dedication to peace clear to the world.

You have my congratulations and best wishes.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Ambassador Eaton to the President

JULY 5, 1960

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament has come to an unhappy end.

I regret that it has not resulted in discussion or agreement which would have, at least, pointed in the direction of halting the buildup of armaments. From this, one day, might have come the elimination of national forces and the progressive establishment of an effective international peace force.

I undertook this assignment because of my hope that there might have been constructive talks—although I was without illusion—and because of my conviction of your own dedication and deep devotion to the cause of peace in a world where men can live in freedom without fear of oppression.

I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to serve our country.

Respectfully yours,

FREDRICK M. EATON

America to the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament on 27 June 1960 (TNCD/7 of 27 June 1960)

IV. UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE CONFERENCE

UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Ambassador Fredrick M. Eaton, Chairman, U.S. Representative

Mr. Charles C. Stelle, Minister, Deputy U.S. Representative

Advisers

Mr. Alexander Akalovsky, Department of State
Mr. Vincent N. Baker, Department of State
Mr. N. Spencer Barnes, Department of State
Mr. Jeremy Blanchet, Department of State
Rear Admiral Paul L. Dudley, U.S.N., Senior

Military Adviser, Department of Defense
Mr. F. Richards Ford, III, Department of Defense
Mr. G. McMurtrie Godley, Department of State
Mr. Robert E. Matteson, Department of State
Mr. Alan G. Mencher, Department of State
Captain Willard deL. Michael, U.S.N., Department of Defense

Mr. D. F. Musser, Atomic Energy Commission
Mr. John M. Stuart, Jr., Public Affairs Officer, American Consulate General, Geneva

Mr. Robert G. Sturgill, Department of State
Mr. Charles A. Sullivan, Department of State
Lt. Colonel Harry E. Tabor, U.S. Army, Department of Defense

Mr. Malcolm Toon, Department of State
Mr. Henry S. Villard, Minister, U.S. Representative at the European Office of the United Nations

Mr. Lawrence D. Weiler, Department of State
Colonel Thomas W. Wolfe, U.S.A.F., Department of Defense

Secretaries of the Delegation

Mr. Richard C. Hagan, Department of State
Mr. Virgil L. Moore, U.S. Resident Delegation and Consulate General, Geneva

V. OTHER DELEGATIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONFERENCE

1. Delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria . . . (4 members)
2. Delegation of Canada . . . (5 members)

3. Delegation of the Czechoslovak Republic . . . (11 members)
4. Delegation of France . . . (19 members)
5. Delegation of Italy . . . (10 members)
6. Delegation of Polish People's Republic . . . (8 members)
7. Delegation of Rumanian People's Republic . . . (9 members)
8. Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . (17 members)
9. Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . (20 members)

U.S. Welcomes August 15 Meeting of U.N. Disarmament Commission

Following is the text of a letter from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, to Luis Padilla Nervo, Chairman, U.N. Disarmament Commission.

U.S./U.N. press release 3453

AUGUST 5, 1960

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to reply to your letter of July 29, 1960 in which you ask my views regarding the suggestion that the Disarmament Commission be convened on August 15th.

It is well known that the United States favors an early meeting of the Disarmament Commission.¹ We are therefore fully in accord with the proposal that the Disarmament Commission should meet on or about August 15th.

The convening of a Disarmament Commission meeting is of course thoroughly in accord with the communique issued by the Governments of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States on September 7, 1959² which stated that . . . "It is the intention of the four Governments that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be kept appropriately informed of the progress of the deliberations of the [Ten-Nation Disarmament] Committee. For this purpose, the four Governments have agreed that the Committee will present reports on its work to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and, through it, to the

United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council".

Moreover, and particularly in light of recent developments, an early meeting of the Disarmament Commission is entirely consistent with, and responsive to the resolution³ adopted by the Commission at its last meeting on September 10, 1959 which "welcomes the declared intention of the countries concerned to keep the Disarmament Commission appropriately informed of the progress of their deliberations", and its recommendation "that it be convened whenever deemed necessary".

I know that you regard the scope of the meeting of the Disarmament Commission as a matter for the members of the Commission themselves to decide. The United States requested this meeting to provide opportunity to report on the discussions which took place in Geneva, and at the same time intends to inform the Disarmament Commission of its proposals which were made at the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva⁴ and which, together with other proposals, provide a basis for further negotiation. It is not the intention of the United States at this meeting to request the Disarmament Commission to make decisions regarding specific measures of disarmament. We believe that the most constructive outcome of the Disarmament Commission meeting would be a resolution which registers the common desire for prompt resumption of negotiations.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE

U.S. Repeats Demand for Release of RB-47 Officers Held by Soviets

U.S. NOTE OF AUGUST 4¹

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, on instructions from its Government, has the honor to state the following:

¹ For text, see *ibid.*, p. 439.

² For text, see *ibid.*, July 18, 1960, p. 90.

³ Delivered to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the American Embassy at Moscow on Aug. 4 (press release 427).

¹ For a statement by President Eisenhower and a letter from Ambassador Lodge to Chairman Padilla Nervo, see BULLETIN of Aug. 15, 1960, p. 253.

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 28, 1959, p. 438.

In its note of July 18² with regard to the RB-47 case, the United States Government repeated its demand for the release of the two Air Force Officers, Lieutenant Olmstead and Lieutenant McKone, who are being detained illegally, and its further demand that a representative of the Embassy be permitted to see them without delay.

In its reply of August 2, the Soviet Government has failed to respond to these requests. Indeed, the Soviet reply merely restates the baseless Soviet version of this event and is evidently aimed at diverting attention again from the Soviet illegal behavior in the RB-47 case by dragging in once again the U-2 incident. The Soviet Government cannot divest itself of the serious responsibility it bears in the RB-47 case by this deliberate attempt to confuse these two cases, which were entirely different in character as the Soviet Government well knows.

In the meantime, the Security Council has considered the RB-47 case³ and has overwhelmingly rejected the Soviet Union's position. The peoples of the world were astonished that the Soviet Union vetoed both this Government's resolution calling for an impartial and objective investigation of the RB-47 incident, and the Italian Government's humanitarian resolution calling upon the Soviet Government to admit representatives of the International Red Cross to see the men in order to reassure their families as to their well-being.

The Soviet Union's refusal to agree to an objective investigation of the RB-47 case is incomprehensible in the face of urging from such non-permanent members of the Security Council as Ceylon, Tunisia, Ecuador, Argentina, and Italy. The veto of the Italian resolution, designed to relieve the anxiety of the families of the men, was callous and inhumane.

The United States Government can only conclude from these actions that the Soviet Government has decided, for purposes of its own, to hold these two men in illegal detention and to seal them off from all contact with the outside world in flagrant disregard of international law and practice.

As was conclusively demonstrated in the Se-

curity Council, the RB-47 aircraft, which was on a legitimate mission on a course carefully charted to carry it well outside Soviet waters, did not violate Soviet territory at any time. At no time did it approach closer than about 30 miles from the Soviet coast, and even this approach was forced upon the RB-47 by a Soviet fighter plane which pressed it from the seaward side in an effort to compel it to overfly Soviet territory. The members of the RB-47 crew were wantonly shot down over international waters, long after the time and far away from the place alleged by the Soviet Government.

The United States Government wishes to emphasize the very serious view it takes of the Soviet action. Since the Security Council overwhelmingly rejected the Soviet Union's position in this case, the United States Government fails to see on what basis the Soviet Union is continuing to detain American airmen at present illegally incarcerated by Soviet authorities. It demands again that the Soviet Government move immediately to permit a representative of the American Embassy at Moscow to see Lieutenant Olmstead and Lieutenant McKone at once and to make arrangements for their return to the United States. It further requests that the Soviet Government provide any information that it may have regarding the men of the RB-47 crew who are still unaccounted for.

Should there be any further delay in the arrangements for the return of the men, the United States Government also reiterates the request that representatives of the International Red Cross be allowed to see the men in order that word of their health and well-being may be given to the members of their families.

The United States Government requests an urgent reply to the demands contained in its note of July 18 for the release of Lieutenant Olmstead and Lieutenant McKone and for immediate access to them.

SOVIET NOTE OF AUGUST 2⁴

Unofficial translation

No. 79/OSA

Having familiarized itself with the United States note of July 18, the Soviet Government states that the U.S.

²For text, see BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 209.

³For background and texts of resolutions, see *ibid.*, Aug. 15, 1960, p. 235.

⁴Delivered to Edward L. Freers, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires, at Moscow on Aug. 2 by Acting Soviet Foreign Minister V. S. Semenov.

Government continues to adhere to the position of an unfounded denial of the fact of the intrusion into Soviet airspace of the American military aircraft RB-47 on July 1 of this year. By distorting reality the U.S. Government apparently counts on putting a screen around the policy of illegal, provocative activities with respect to the U.S.S.R. which has met with just condemnation throughout the world.

Repetition in the aforementioned note, as well as in speeches of the American representative in the Security Council, of unsubstantiated assertions that the bomber RB-47, downed after the violation of the Soviet border, was allegedly engaged in carrying out "a legal task over international waters," does not make such assertions convincing.

The U.S. Government adduced no proof which would support its assertions regarding the circumstances of the flight of the bomber RB-47, nor could it adduce such proof, since the intrusion of this aircraft into the airspace of the U.S.S.R. is a fact established precisely by appropriate organs of the Soviet Union. Pretensions to conduct some kind of "on-the-spot investigation," which have been advanced by the U.S. Government, can be appraised only as a maneuver designed to distract attention from the inadmissible character of the activities of American military aviation. Instead of inventing new methods of espionage in the region of the Soviet border, the U.S. Government should concern itself to end once and for all the provocative sallies by its military aircraft into the airspace of the U.S.S.R.

Assertions concerning the alleged "legal" character of the assignment of the aircraft which violated the Soviet border, the absurd version about "the study of electromagnetic phenomena" which the U.S. Government did not abandon in its note of July 18, illustrate especially vividly the entire unsoundness of the new effort to justify aggressive actions of the U.S. Air Force with the help of fabrications spread by official sources in Washington.

The U.S. Government expresses its dissatisfaction that the note of the Soviet Government mentions the mendacious declarations to which official U.S. organs attempted to resort to disguise the fact of the aggressive intrusion across Soviet boundaries by the American U-2 aircraft, downed May 1 in the area of Sverdlovsk. It asserts that the intrusion which took place May 1 "is not connected with the present incident," that is, with the violation of U.S.S.R. boundaries by the RB-47 aircraft. It is possible, of course, to agree that these are two separate incidents. In one of them the violator was downed deep inside Soviet territory; in the other, the crime was interrupted in the initial stage, after the violation by the American aircraft of the Soviet state boundary. However, it is perfectly apparent that the essence of the actions of the U.S. military aircraft in both cases was one and the same, and that behind them stands the same unprecedented policy of premeditated provocations with respect to the Soviet Union, openly announced by the U.S. Government in May of this year but carried out by it in practice already in the course of a prolonged period. As is evident, devices with the help of which the U.S. Government attempts to lead astray public opinion and

escape the responsibility for its aggressive activities, which constitute the rude violation of generally accepted norms of international law, increase international tension, and create a threat to peace, have also not changed.

The Soviet Government again confirms the position stated in its notes of July 11 and 15⁶ and repeats its emphatic protest against the violation of the Soviet boundary by the American RB-47 bomber, which took place July 1. The U.S.S.R. Government expects that the U.S. Government will put an end to the provocative actions of the American Air Force against the Soviet Union. If this is not done, the Government of the Soviet Union will take, as it has already warned earlier, necessary measures to insure the safety of the peoples of the Soviet Union by all means available to it.

Moscow, August 2, 1960.

United States Seeks Access to Francis Powers

Press release 433 dated August 6

Following are the texts of notes exchanged by the U.S. and Soviet Governments regarding Francis Gary Powers.¹

U.S. NOTE OF MAY 10

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to public statements of the Soviet Government indicating that an American civilian, Francis Gary Powers, is under detention in Moscow. The Embassy requests that an officer of the Embassy be permitted to interview Mr. Powers.

U.S. AIDE MEMOIRE OF JULY 11

The Embassy refers to its note No. 1039 of May 10, 1960 and reiterates its request that an Embassy officer be permitted to interview Francis Gary Powers.

The Embassy wishes to inform the Ministry that the United States Government urges the Soviet Government to grant the visas for their attorneys requested by the Powers family in their telegram

⁶ For texts, see BULLETIN of Aug. 1, 1960, p. 164, and Aug. 8, 1960, p. 210.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of May 30, 1960, p. 85.

of June 23, 1960 to Premier Khrushchev. The Embassy requests the earliest possible reply from the Ministry concerning these visas.

Reference is made also to the telegram of July 8, 1960 from Francis Gary Powers to his father, Oliver W. Powers, and made available by the latter to the Department of State. The Embassy requests the Ministry to inform it as to the identity of the Soviet defense counsel mentioned in the telegram and as to the means by which the family's legal counsel might communicate with him at the earliest possible date so that they might make preliminary contact with him in order to cooperate with him in the matter.

U.S. NOTE OF JULY 30

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, under instructions of the Government of the United States, has the honor to refer to the Embassy's note No. 1039 of May 10, 1960, and the Embassy's aide memoire of July 11, 1960, regarding the case of Francis Gary Powers.

In its note of May 10 the Embassy requested that an Embassy officer be permitted to interview Francis Gary Powers, an American civilian under detention by the Soviet Government. Since that date the Embassy has made frequent and repeated requests that the Soviet Government, in accordance with normal diplomatic practice, reply promptly to the Embassy's note and that it permit an Embassy officer to interview Mr. Powers. On July 11, 1960, the Embassy handed the Soviet Foreign Minister an aide memoire again reiterating its request. In spite of the frequent and insistent requests of the Embassy, the Soviet Foreign Ministry has made no reply to the Embassy's representations.

On July 9, an announcement of the official Soviet news agency, TASS, stated that the inquiry in the case of Mr. Powers had been completed, that the indictment of Mr. Powers had been endorsed by the Prosecutor General of the U.S.S.R. and the case referred to the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. for consideration. A subsequent TASS release on July 18 stated that the trial of Mr. Powers had been fixed for August 17, 1960. The Embassy notes that in a press conference of May 12, 1960, Chair-

man Khrushchev stated that he could not answer a question concerning the Embassy's access to Mr. Powers "because the investigation is proceeding." The Embassy protests most strongly against the protracted delay of the Soviet Foreign Ministry in replying to the Embassy's original request in its note of May 10 and asks most urgently that, in view of the completion of the investigation of Mr. Powers and the setting of his trial for an early date, an officer of the Embassy now be permitted to interview Mr. Powers.

In its aide memoire of July 11 the Embassy also urged that the Soviet Government grant visas for the attorneys requested by the Powers family in their telegram of June 23, 1960 to Chairman Khrushchev. The aide memoire further requested that the Ministry inform the Embassy as to the identity of the Soviet defense counsel mentioned in the telegram and as to the means by which the legal counsel of the family might communicate with the Soviet defense counsel at the earliest possible date in order to cooperate with him in any appropriate manner.

The Embassy reiterates the requests made in the aide memoire and requests that the Ministry furnish it an urgent reply.

SOVIET REPLY OF AUGUST 4

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and with reference to the Embassy's note of May 10 and the Embassy's aide memoire of July 11, 1960, has the honor to state the following:

As has already been officially announced, the American citizen Francis Gary Powers has been indicted for criminal responsibility under Article 2 of the Law on Criminal Responsibility for State Crimes (Espionage). The case involving the charge against F. G. Powers has been assigned for hearing to the Military Collegium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Court in accordance with Articles 9 and 16 of the Decree on Military Tribunals.

At the present time, by request of F. Powers, a member of the Moscow City Lawyers' Collegium has been assigned to his defense, Attorney Griniv, with whom F. Powers has already had several meetings.

In view of the above, and in accordance with Soviet judicial legislation, the attorneys mentioned in the Embassy's aide memoire cannot be permitted to participate in the F. Powers case.

Concerning the question of a meeting with the Soviet attorney conducting the Powers case, relatives of F. Powers, should they come to Moscow, will be granted this opportunity.

International Educational and Cultural Relations: The Boundaries of Action, Governmental and Private

by Robert H. Thayer¹

I am particularly gratified at being invited to assist in opening this conference tonight. In the first place, the subject of the conference, "Cultural Aid to Underdeveloped Areas: Education and Training," is not only a subject with which the Government of the United States is very vitally concerned today; it is indeed a subject which is of vital concern to all the free nations of the world. Education and training is being demanded as a matter of right by many thousands of people covering enormous areas of the world—people suffering severely from intellectual and spiritual as well as economic hunger—and they are going to get education and training as quickly as they can, somewhere. In the second place, the title for this session of the conference, "International Educational and Cultural Relations: The Boundaries of Action, Governmental and Private," defines a problem, the solution of which I have been working hard to find ever since I was appointed to my present position in the Department of State 18 months ago.

One can perhaps find no better example of the rapidity and depth of the change that is taking place in the world today than in the phenomenon of this great, unwieldy, bureaucratic machine that is our Government suddenly being actively plunged into the operational field of education, a field hitherto reserved to private endeavor of

a highly specialized type. Now when something of this kind happens in this magnificently flexible democratic system of ours, it does not, as you well know, happen in an orderly, logical, and understandable fashion—it just happens. And almost overnight 17 different agencies of the Government became engaged in the same type of work which had for years been occupying the attention of great American private institutions, foundations, universities, and others—the work of international education. Government was impelled into this activity through its foreign relations because of the magnitude of the international need—a need to which the American people had long been responding; and so we suddenly find ourselves today, both in the public and in the private domain, with the same basic objectives, all striving to the same end, all going to the same very limited sources of supply for our tools, all discovering how very limited the time is in which to achieve our objectives, and none of us very sure of how we are going to attain them.

It seemed to me, when I was asked by the Secretary of State what could be done to coordinate this activity of all these Government agencies and what could be done to make their efforts an intelligent and efficient complement to the many different activities of private institutions, that the first thing to do, after analyzing the nature and scope of Government activity, was to find some means of drawing together representatives of the public and private domains for quiet, uninterrupted, and serious discussion of objectives and means of attainment. And so we held a conference

¹ Address made before the Harvard Summer School of Arts, Sciences, and Education at Cambridge, Mass., on Aug. 1 (press release 424). Mr. Thayer is Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

ence in April of 1959 at Annapolis at which representatives of the Government and of the universities and of our great foundations came together at the invitation of the Secretary of State for a 2-day thorough discussion of our common problems. I am glad to see here tonight some of those who contributed so much to the success of that conference.

I believe that I am justified in saying that from this conference came the formation of the Committee on the University in World Affairs, headed by former President [James Lewis] Morrill of the University of Minnesota. We are awaiting with great anticipation the results of the work of this committee in exploring the role of the American university. Its labors should make a very substantial contribution to the solution of the problem presented by the title of this session of this conference.

Again at Harvard this spring we gathered together representatives of many fields of activity in the United States to visit with Government representatives to discuss that absorbing question of the cultural relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. There has been much misinformation and much misunderstanding of the Government's operation of our exchanges with the Soviet Union, and I believe that this conference served to clarify the problem and contribute to a greater understanding of our objectives and the basic reason for our operating methods of attaining them. These conferences have already justified the time and effort put into them. They have great value not only for the development of ideas but particularly as a means of communication between the diverse groups concerned with international education. We need more of them in every area of the country, and this conference at Harvard is therefore particularly welcome to me and to all of us in the State Department. We are so keenly aware of the need for more cooperative effort in this field of international education and cultural relations.

I would like to add that we are planning this fall to hold another conference on the question "What contributions private industry has in the past and can in the future make in the field of international education in the less developed areas," and there are other important fields that justify conferences. What contributions can be made by science, agriculture, and labor? Every

group in this country can and should be thinking of the stupendous task that lies immediately ahead in this field.

Exploring the Requirements

As I thought over the topic assigned to me for this address this evening, "The Boundaries of Governmental and Private Action," I was reminded of an article in the *Harvard Guardian* which was written by your distinguished chairman. I believe that the article appeared in the fall of 1937. In the article, Dr. [William Y.] Elliott urged that this country go to war with Hitler's Germany and made the profound observation that after we had fought the war we would know what it was that we fought for. I suggest, gentlemen, that after we have conceived and placed into operation a genuine, realistic, and workable international educational and cultural program we can look back and review what we have accomplished and the boundaries which I am to discuss this evening will have been defined.

If we take the word "boundaries" as applied to a land mass, it is obvious that no boundary can be established until the terrain has been suitably explored. No boundary could be run between Mexico and the United States, or between Canada and the United States, until men had first discovered, explored, settled, and claimed the land and established some form of political organization to make good the claims.

I do not want to press my analogy too far; we are not involved with claims but rather, I would think, with responsibilities for action in international education and cultural matters. However, I would suggest that the terrain itself has been but slightly explored, and at this conference I think that we ought to be more concerned with exploration than with boundaries. We ought to think of ourselves as mixed parties of surveyors, not trying to run lines of demarcation but, rather, exploring the requirements of other countries for education and our responsibilities to make a contribution to their welfare and what and how each of the groups represented here can best contribute. I suppose that this is in a sense working toward establishing boundaries, but I suggest that the only boundaries we can really talk about are those familiar to us at home. Here we have some notion of the line separating the work of foundations,

universities, and the Government, but I am not at all sure that those boundaries apply when we move into the foreign field.

Relationships Between Government and Foundations

The foundations have long been engaged in educational, cultural, and technical work abroad. The programs of the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations are much older than the present programs of the U.S. Government.

I believe that it is quite clear what the role is of a foundation in the utilization of its money within the United States. I suspect that from time to time one or the other of the foundations is placed under pressure to spend money in ways it would prefer not to, but I believe that it is generally true to say that they know what it is they want to do and that, by and large, what they want to do they can do without feeling they are in competition with the larger resources of the Federal Government and State governments. Their contribution to our colleges and universities, and to research of all kinds, and to the cultural growth of our country, is enormous. But there lie before us the problem and the need to relate the work of the foundations to that of the Government—or, if you will, vice versa—in the foreign field. My suggestion of the need for a relationship does not mean to imply Government control of foundation work. I merely mean that an exploration of foundation programs and Government programs might reveal what are those things, by regions or countries in which there are foundation programs, that a foundation can do and do well and with satisfaction, that the Government cannot do or ought not to try to do.

Now a determination of what the foundations ought to do instead of the Government should never be made on the basis of Government budgetary limitations. This approach I deplore, for it destroys the meaning and significance of the corporate life of the foundation. I will not suggest here what ought to be the foundation's role abroad or even how the Government and the foundations ought to work together, but I do think we ought at this conference to explore this problem. I am sure that from time to time the foundations examine their programs over the years and reach a conclusion as to what ought to be the direction they should take or, if you will, what boundaries they should establish for themselves. The need

for relating foundation and Government work is, to me, inescapable. The problem is how can it be done so as to enhance the work of the foundations as well as our own.

Historical Role of Universities

If we turn now to the universities, we have, I think, a far more difficult problem. The role of universities in international education and culture at this point in time is, I believe, less defined than that of the foundations. After all, the foundations have the money to underwrite projects in foreign countries, and, by and large, the universities have not. Yet the university has historically always been engaged in international educational and cultural affairs by the mere fact that it is a university and that the members of faculties teach, write, and do research and move from university to university.

Universities are older than the modern state and have, as we all know, had much to do with the growth of our society. This has come, in part, on the international side through what we call academic exchange, which I think should be thought of both as an exchange of persons and as an exchange of ideas, whether through persons or books. Under the conditions which have existed since the end of the war, the United States Government has found it necessary to finance a part of these academic types of exchange, thus introducing new elements in this age-old process.

In the last 10 years many of our universities and technical schools have entered into what one might think of as a modified kind of exchange through contracts with the International Cooperation Administration for work in the less developed countries. Under these contracts universities have sent abroad teams of faculty members, or teams composed in part of faculty members and others, to carry out a specific assignment for the Government. These contract teams are sometimes associated with a foreign university and sometimes not. They may be establishing a technical institute, or they may be advising a foreign government on public administration, or doing both. This contract system has been found by ICA to be a useful mechanism for getting done work requiring continuity and a team of men.

I do not believe that this contract system as really has precipitated the American university

into the problems of international education. It would seem to me that the universities must come to define for themselves their role as universities in this field of endeavor, regardless of the source of financing of their activities. A Government contract for an assignment in a foreign country hardly, it seems to me, involves the university as a university in the foreign field. I believe that there is an enormous role for the university in international educational and cultural affairs, but that role needs to be defined, for as yet the boundaries of university action are not in the least discernible. As I said before, we are looking to the Committee on the University in World Affairs for guidance on this problem.

Two Roles of Government

Finally, a few words about the Government. The role of the Government, in one sense, is no more defined than the role of the foundations or the universities. I suppose that the only groups in the country who have defined their roles in international education are the missionaries, who represent institutions—religious institutions—older than both universities and nation states and who, like the universities, have had much to do with influencing the shaping of the society in which we live. I have suggested the need for explorations as regards both foundations and universities, and I certainly think that the same is true as regards the Federal Government and its foreign work. It seems to me that here we can define what ought to be the role of the Government as, in part, distinguished from the roles of the universities and foundations, though I will not go so far as to say that the Government has, as yet, adequately assumed its role. I do not think that the time has yet come—though I believe that the time is close at hand—when the Government will play its role fully and adequately.

The Federal Government has two roles, and both are quite obvious roles, and in both it has assumed responsibilities but not as much responsibility as I believe it must and ought. One role is that of policymaker, and the other is that of furnishing the resources to carry out the policy.

At the present moment we do not really have an international educational policy, and this, I think, we need. And at the point of policy formation for international education work I think we

need some degree of "fusion," if you will, of foundations, universities, and Government. By "fusion" I mean some identification as to the general purposes and the ideals we are moving toward. The policy we need, though it will finally be written within the Government, surely depends on all of you as much as on us in Washington.

I have said that we do not really have an international educational policy. That we don't. We are, as you know, concerned with international education in many ways. ICA is deeply involved in education but largely as it relates to economic development and then only in specific fields designated by the Congress. It would seem to me that, though all education undergirds economic development, it is a mistake to limit our educational work to those particular things which in our judgment promote economic development. This means that we are largely concerned with the technical and are in no position to assist in the growth of educational systems in other countries embracing the whole of education.

Our Department of Defense runs a very large training program and brings to this country for technical military training many thousands a year. There is an enormous potential here for education beyond the military requirements, and I think this is especially important as one notes the changing character of the military establishment in this day and age. I suppose that the State Department, in certain of its exchange programs, comes the closest to having an international educational program related to overriding national political objectives without being limited by either military or economic factors.

I believe that we must move on, and rapidly, from this point and work in the coming months for a policy which will permit the broadening of our work in the international educational field. I think that this policy needs to be broad enough not only to direct the particular programs of the Federal Government but to provide guidelines to the universities and foundations. I do not believe that the universities can take their full part in this foreign effort until such time as the Government has provided the needed political leadership and direction.

I will conclude by saying that, to me, we are all exploring, that we need not so much to establish boundaries between foundations, universities, and the Government as to establish the boundaries of

what ought to be the total United States effort in the international educational and cultural field. When the terrain has been explored and the Government has defined the boundary through policy, I do believe that it will be easier than it is now to find the boundaries between foundations, universities, and Government programs. An enormous effort born of some degree of fusion is required, and it is toward this that I have been working for the past 18 months in Washington and in the various conferences I have mentioned.

Finally, I cannot emphasize too strongly here and at every possible occasion the seriousness with which the Department of State views the need for concentrated and cooperative effort on the part of every segment of American life, both public and private, in a very difficult task. That task is to assist the recently developing nations of the world in their legitimate and understandable desire to hurdle the centuries we required for our development and take the shortest route to sound social, political, and economic equality within the family of nations. Our united effort must be to persuade them that the soundest route is not always the shortest route, but this effort must be inspiring and will require sacrifices on the part of not only the taxpayer but also the foundations, the universities, and all of our great private institutions—not sacrifices of principle or of standards of learning or of ethics, not sacrifices of philosophical doctrine, nor of the traditions of intellectual freedom, for all of these form the basis of the value of our institutions—they are the buoys marking the claim to freedom—but sacrificing the security and the comfortable isolation that pervade institutions which have been hitherto bounded by principally domestic considerations. We can live and work within the United States effectively on our own, but if we are to live and work abroad—and that is our destiny for many decades to come—we are going to need very close, cooperative effort. This conference can perform a great public service by exploring the nature of this cooperation.

Policy Toward American Republics Reaffirmed by United States

On July 29 the White House announced the President's intention to appoint Richard R. Rubottom, Jr., to be Ambassador to Argentina and the designation of Thomas C. Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Following is a White House statement of that date read to newsmen by James C. Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President.

White House (Denver, Colo.) press release dated July 29

These new appointments involve no change in United States policies toward Latin America. Both of these officers are career Foreign Service officers with long experience in Latin America. Mr. Rubottom has served in the Department over 4 years since his last field assignment, and his return to a field post this fall is in accord with the normal Foreign Service assignment pattern.

United States policies toward Latin America are clear. The President's announcement last week of his intention to go forward in cooperation with other American Republics with additional programs of economic assistance to help support the efforts of the peoples of Latin America to achieve a better standard of living will help to chart new areas in the economic sector.

In the political sector the United States has been equally forthright. We are dedicated to the strengthening of the entire inter-American system. We have reiterated our repudiation of dictatorships of the left and the right and have reaffirmed our full support of the Rio Treaty and other inter-American agreements in which all of the American states have assumed a collective responsibility for repelling outside intervention in the affairs of this hemisphere.

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 1, 1960, p. 166.

Political Divisions of Africa¹

INDEPENDENT STATES (in chronological order)

Country	Date of independence	Capital	Area ² (in thousands of square miles)	Population ³ (in thousands)	Former legal status	Present chief official and title
Ethiopia (includes Eritrea).	Since ancient times.	Addis Ababa	455	21, 600		Haile Selassie I, Emperor.
Liberia	1847	Monrovia	43	1, 250	Private colony	William V. S. Tubman, President.
Union of South Africa (includes Walvis Bay).	1910	Pretoria and Capetown.	472	14, 673	British colonies and independent republics.	Hendrik F. Verwoerd, Prime Minister.
United Arab Republic (Egyptian Region).	1922	Cairo	386	25, 032	British protectorate.	Gamal 'Abd al-Nasir, President.
Libya	December 24, 1951.	Tripoli and Benghazi.	679	1, 153	Former Italian colony jointly administered since World War II by France and Britain.	Idris I, King.
The Sudan	January 1, 1956.	Khartoum	967	11, 390	Anglo-Egyptian condominium.	Gen. Ibrahim Abboud, President of the Supreme Council
Morocco	March 2, 1956	Rabat	174	10, 330	French and Spanish protectorates, International Zone of Tangier.	Mohamed V, King.
Tunisia	March 20, 1956.	Tunis	48	3, 880	French protectorate.	Habib Bourguiba, President.
Ghana	March 6, 1957	Accra	92	4, 911	British colony and protectorate, British U.N. trusteeship (British Togoland).	Kwame Nkrumah, President.
Guinea	October 2, 1958.	Conakry	95	2, 707	French overseas territory.	Sékou Touré, President.
Cameroun	January 1, 1960.	Yaoundé	167	3, 187	French U.N. trusteeship.	Ahmadou Ahidjo, President.
Togo	April 27, 1960.	Lomé	22	1, 100	"	Sylvanus Olympio, Prime Minister.
Federation of Mali, composed of:	June 20, 1960.	Dakar	541	6, 850	None	Modibo Keita, President.
a. Republic of Senegal.		Dakar	76	2, 550	Autonomous member, French Community.	Mamadou Dia, Prime Minister.
b. Soudanese Republic.		Bamako	465	4, 300	"	Modibo Keita, Prime Minister.
Malagasy Republic (Madagascar).	June 26, 1960	Tananarive	228	5, 184	"	Philibert Tsiranana, President.
Republic of the Congo (Belgian Congo).	June 30, 1960	Léopoldville	905	13, 653	Belgian colony	Joseph Kasavubu, President; Patrice Lumumba, Premier.
Somali Republic (includes Somalia and British Somaliland).	July 1, 1960	Mogadiscio	246	1, 980	Italian U.N. trusteeship and British protectorate.	Abdirasid Ali Scermarche, Prime Minister.

¹ Prepared in the Africa Division of the Office of Research and Analysis for the Mid-East and Africa, Aug. 17, 1960.

² Area figures from *Encyclopaedia Britannica World Atlas*, 1960, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., Chicago, Ill.

³ Population figures from *Population and Vital Statistics Report*, Apr. 1, 1960, United Nations, N.Y.

⁴ No capital.

⁵ Area under 1,000 sq. miles.

⁶ Population under 1,000.



29193 8-60

INDEPENDENT STATES—Continued
(in chronological order)

Country	Date of independence	Capital	Area ² (in thousands of square miles)	Population ³ (in thousands)	Former legal status	Present chief official and title
Dahomey-----	Aug. 1, 1960	Porto-Novo----	45	1, 725	Autonomous member, French Community.	Hubert Maga, Prime Minister.
Niger-----	Aug. 3, 1960	Niamey-----	459	2, 555	"	Hamani Diori, Prime Minister.
Upper Volta-----	Aug. 5, 1960	Ouagadougou----	106	4, 000	"	Maurice Yameogo, President.
Ivory Coast-----	Aug. 7, 1960	Abidjan-----	125	3, 103	"	Felix Houphouët-Boigny, Prime Minister.
Republic of Chad--	Aug. 11, 1960	Ford Lamy-----	495	2, 600	"	François Tombalbaye, Prime Minister.
Central African Republic.	Aug. 13, 1960	Bangui-----	242	1, 177	"	David Dacko, Prime Minister.
Republic of Congo.	Aug. 15, 1960	Brazzaville----	135	795	"	Fulbert Youlou, President.
Gabon-----	Aug. 17, 1960	Libreville-----	102	421	"	Léon M'ba, Prime Minister.

STATES SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE INDEPENDENCE SOON
(in chronological order)

Country	Date of independence	Capital	Area ² (in thousands of square miles)	Population ³ (in thousands)	Former legal status	Present chief official and title
Nigeria-----	Oct. 1, 1960	Lagos-----	339	33, 663	British colony and protectorate.	Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister.
Mauritania-----	Nov. 28, 1960	Nouakchott-----	419	725	Autonomous member, French Community.	Mocktar Ould Dad-dah, Prime Minister.
Sierra Leone-----	Apr. 27, 1961	Freetown-----	28	2, 260	British colony and protectorate.	Sir Milton Margai, Premier.

OTHER TERRITORIES
(grouped by metropole)

Territory	Capital	Area ² (in thousands of square miles)	Population ³ (in thousands)	Present status
France				
Algeria-----	Algiers is the administrative capital of the 13 northern departments. The 2 Saharan departments are administered by the Ministry of the Sahara from Paris.	920	10, 265	15 Departments of the French Republic.
Comoro Islands-----	Dzaoudzi----- (4)	1 (5)	182 26	Overseas territory. Small islands adjacent to Madagascar which have remained under the French minister charged with overseas departments and territories as unclassified possessions.
Europa, Juan de Nova, Bassas da India, Iles Glorieuses, etc.				

OTHER TERRITORIES—Continued
(grouped by metropole)

Territory	Capital	Area ² (in thousands of square miles)	Population ³ (in thousands)	Present status
French Somaliland.....	Djibouti.....	9	69	Overseas territory.
Réunion.....	Saint Denis.....	1	321	Overseas Department of the French Republic.
<i>Portugal</i>				
Angola (includes Cabinda).....	Luanda.....	481	4, 508	Overseas province of Portugal.
Cape Verde Islands.....	Praia.....	2	192	"
Mozambique.....	Lourenço Marques.....	298	6, 234	"
Portuguese Guinea.....	Bissau.....	14	559	"
São Tomé and Príncipe (includes São João Baptista da Ajuda).	São Tomé.....	0. 3	62	"
<i>Spain</i>				
Ceuta.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	61	Spanish possession (<i>plaza de soberanía</i>).
Fernando Póo (Fernando Póo, Annobón, and adjacent islands).	Santa Isabel.....	1	45	African province of Spain.
Ifni.....	Sidi Ifni.....	1	52	"
Islas Chafarinas.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	Spanish possession (<i>plaza de soberanía</i>).
Melilla.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	85	"
Peñon Velez de la Gomera.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	"
Peñon de Alhucemas.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	"
Rio Muni (Rio Muni, Corisco, Great Elobey, Little Elobey, and adjacent islands).	Bata.....	10	172	African province of Spain.
Spanish Sahara (Rio de Oro and Sekia el Hamra).	Villa Cisneros.....	103	19	"
<i>Union of South Africa</i>				
South West Africa.....	Windhoek.....	318	554	League of Nations mandate administered by the Union of South Africa.
<i>Belgium</i>				
Ruanda-Urundi.....	Usumbura.....	21	4, 700	Belgian U.N. trusteeship.
<i>United Kingdom</i>				
Basutoland.....	Maseru.....	12	658	Colony.
Bechuanaland.....	Mafeking.....	275	337	Protectorate.
British Cameroons.....	Buea.....	34	1, 621	British U.N. trusteeship (plebiscite planned for 1961 to decide future status of the British Cameroons with respect to Nigeria and Cameroun).
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland).	Salisbury.....	490	7, 990	Semiautonomous member of Commonwealth.
Gambia.....	Bathurst.....	4	289	Colony and protectorate.
Kenya.....	Nairobi.....	225	6, 450	"
Mauritius (including dependencies).	Port Louis.....	1	650	Colony.
Seychelles.....	Victoria.....	0. 1	42	"
Swaziland.....	Mbabane.....	7	237	Protectorate.
Tanganyika.....	Dar es Salaam.....	362	9, 076	British U.N. trusteeship.
Uganda.....	Entebbe.....	94	6, 517	Protectorate.
Zanzibar and Pemba.....	Zanzibar.....	1	304	"

President Praises Ghana for Support of U.N. Assistance to the Congo

The White House on July 31 made public the following exchange of messages between President Eisenhower and President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana.

White House (Newport, R.I.) press release dated July 31

President Eisenhower to President Nkrumah

JULY 31, 1960

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for your letter of July twenty-seventh expressing your thanks for the assistance which my Government has been able to provide in airlifting from Accra to Léopoldville Ghanaian forces contributed to the United Nations. The prompt and generous manner in which your Government made its forces available in response to the appeal of the United Nations is deserving of the highest praise.

I agree with you that the United Nations action in the Congo is a most heartening demonstration of the effectiveness with which the world community can cooperate.¹

The American Government is particularly gratified that it has been able to play a part in this operation, and I want to thank you for the indispensable assistance Ghana has given United States aircraft operating through Accra, not only those transporting Ghanaian troops but also those making transit stops with Moroccan and Tunisian forces. This splendid support has been a vital element in the success of our common effort.

I have learned of the military proficiency and the high morale with which the forces of Ghana have carried out their duties under the United Nations Command in the Congo. I extend to you and the people of Ghana my admiration and that of the American people for the conspicuously successful contribution of Ghana in support of the United Nations mission of peace in the Congo.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

President Nkrumah to President Eisenhower

JULY 27, 1960

DEAR MR. EISENHOWER: Now that the airlift of Ghana forces to Congo is complete and all Ghana troops have been carried safely to Léopoldville, I should like to send

¹For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 221.

you my personal thanks for the assistance which America has rendered in this regard.

I am particularly happy that United States of America, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United Arab Republic aircraft were able to use Accra Airfield to cooperate with Ghanaian civil aviation in support of the United Nations. It gives me great pleasure that we have had in Accra so practical a demonstration of international cooperation in carrying out the Security Council Resolution.

I hope that you will be able to convey to the pilots and the crews who took part in the operation, my thanks and the thanks of the people of Ghana for the service which they have rendered so ably and efficiently in the cause of upholding the principles of the United Nations.

Yours sincerely,

KWAME NKRUMAH

President Sends Message to Korean Students

White House (Newport, R.I.) press release dated August 2

The White House made public on August 2 the following message from President Eisenhower to the students of the Republic of Korea. This message was requested by Daeyung Kim, a member of the editorial staff of the Chungang Herald, an English-language school paper of Chungang University at Seoul, Korea.

JULY 26, 1960

TO THE STUDENTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA:

Throughout my life I will cherish the memory of the warm and gracious welcome recently accorded me by the people of Korea.¹ For this I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude. Your welcome afforded convincing proof, if it were necessary, of the friendly and strong bonds between our two peoples.

The world well knows the dedication of the youth and students of Korea to the cause of freedom. You have proven your courage and your willingness to defend man's most precious possession. You and your country are now embarked upon the intricate, more difficult task of ensuring that the liberties you have won will find lasting expression in the Republic of Korea.

¹President Eisenhower made a trip to the Far East June 14-20, during which he visited the Republic of Korea. For background, see BULLETIN of July 25, 1960, p. 123.

Youth has the priceless assets of vigor and enthusiasm. Yet you must also bring to your tasks a sense of infinite patience, broad vision, and deep humility if you are to meet the challenge which faces Korea and the world. Courage alone will not suffice. You must demonstrate that sense of individual responsibility and self-restraint which will serve to guarantee both freedom and its inseparable twin, justice. Free men face a difficult choice; whether they will dissipate their liberty through license; or whether they will take up the burdens which liberty imposes and go forward in the service of mankind. For freedom must be served as well as sought. It imposes duties and obligations, as well as bestowing rights and liberties. Your success in fulfilling these obligations will determine whether your generation will succeed in maintaining a balance between the extremes of license on the one hand and repression on the other.

There are those who would deny you your freedom to achieve their aims—indeed they want to dominate the world. They exploit both anarchy and servitude. They seek to convince you that the free world poses a threat to peace and progress. In this they persist despite clear evidence that they, not we, have brought a third of the world's people into brutal subjugation; that they, not we, foment anarchy in troubled lands; that they, not we, refuse to disarm and, instead, threaten to rain down instruments of destruction upon the weak and the powerful alike. There is, indeed, existing a threat to peace and progress, to your right of self-determination and your liberties; it is posed by the ruthless colonial aggressions which characterize international communism.

Your generation, in Korea and elsewhere, faces as none before it the issue as to whether mankind is to progress united in freedom and justice or whether nations will fall victim one by one to a new and deadly colonialism. Upon your response depend the future of your nation and, in considerable measure, the future of the free world. I have deep confidence that you are equal to the task be-

fore you, and I wish you full and complete success in this great responsibility.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

1960 Pacific Festival

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS the 1960 Pacific Festival will be held at San Francisco, California, from September 9 to September 18, 1960, inclusive; and

WHEREAS the purpose of this festival is to focus the attention of the world on the interdependence of the cultural and economic interests of the cities, States, and nations bordering the Pacific Ocean and to foster mutual understanding and cordial relations among the peoples of these areas; and

WHEREAS this purpose is consistent with our national policy of promoting peace and friendship through the cultivation of mutually beneficial economic, social, and cultural relationships among the nations and peoples of the world; and

WHEREAS the Congress, by a joint resolution approved July 14, 1960, has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation inviting foreign nations to participate in the 1960 Pacific Festival:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of State to invite, on my behalf, such foreign nations as he may deem appropriate to participate in the 1960 Pacific Festival at San Francisco, California, from September 9 to September 18, 1960.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this fourteenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

¹ No. 3356; 25 Fed. Reg. 6869.

Economic Assistance as a Cooperative Effort of the Free World

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Department of State released on August 4 (press release 431) a special report on the bilateral efforts of the United States and 10 other free-world nations to help the newly developing countries achieve economic progress and self-sustaining growth. Also included in the 66-page document is a section on multilateral aid with particular reference to United Nations technical assistance, the U.N. Special Fund, and the several international financial agencies.

The report, entitled "Economic Assistance as a Cooperative Effort of the Free World," was prepared jointly by the Department of State (including the International Cooperation Administration), the Departments of the Treasury and Defense, the Development Loan Fund, and the Bureau of the Budget. It was prepared in response to section 413(d) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and submitted to the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees on August 1.

The report includes statistics on the expenditures since 1954 by free-world nations to help the less developed countries, figures which clearly indicate the increase in the economic assistance efforts of America's free-world partners. The economic assistance extended by each of the countries is described in some detail.

In a special subsection entitled "New Developments in Multilateral Cooperation" the promising prospects for the newly formed Development Assistance Group (DAG) are outlined. The Development Assistance Group, consisting of 10 capital exporting nations and the European Economic Community, is a consultative group which meets on an informal basis to discuss ways and means of increasing the volume and effectiveness of aid extended by these countries to the less developed areas. It is planned to hold the third meeting of the Development Assistance Group in Washington early in October.

The report assesses existing aid patterns with a characterization of the national aid policies and institutions of major capital exporting countries. In addition, it contains a complete listing and description of the international organizations which deal with economic development in the less developed areas.

EXCERPT FROM REPORT¹

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AS A COOPERATIVE EFFORT OF THE FREE WORLD

Part I. Introduction

This report is submitted in response to section 413(d)² of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which provides that:

"Under the direction of the President, the Department of State and such other agencies of the Government as the President shall deem appropriate shall conduct a study of methods by which the United States and other nations including those which are parties to regional agreements for economic cooperation to which the United States is a party, or any of them, might best together formulate and effectuate programs of assistance to strengthen the economies of free nations so as to advance the principal purposes of this Act, as stated in section 2 thereof."

This document consists of two basic elements:

1. A report on existing patterns of coordination of economic assistance to the less-developed countries, including the manner in which the assistance activities of other free world nations and of multilateral instruments and

¹ The report is divided into three parts, the first two of which are printed here. Part III, "Existing Patterns of Assistance," contains three sections: "Problems in Assessing the Amount of Assistance," "Brief Characterization of National Policies and Institutions of Major Capital Exporting Countries," and "International Organizations Dealing With Economic Development of Less-Developed Areas." The table on p. 295 is taken from Part III. Copies of the full report may be obtained, within the limits of supply, by writing to the Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

² This subsection was added by section 205(m)(5) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959. [Footnote in original.]

organizations are taken into account in the programming of assistance under the Mutual Security Program. This section is concluded by a description of the trends of coordination within the newly formed Development Assistance Group (DAG).²

2. An assessment of the volume of assistance available to advance economic development in the less-developed countries, and the trends of future resource availabilities. This section is supplemented by brief analyses of the national policies of the major capital exporting countries with respect to economic aid and the instruments through which development assistance is provided. There is also provided a complete listing of the international organizations, both worldwide and regional in scope, which deal with economic development of the less-developed areas.

The dimensions of the problems of assisting the individual less-developed countries are only now becoming clear. The need for such assistance is so large that the drive for such assistance must be carried on on all fronts—as part of the drive for the dignity and freedom of man. The tried and successful methods in which the free nations of the world have together formulated and implemented programs of assistance must continue. Therefore a study of such proven methods of cooperation in economic assistance was made and here presented together with comments on the recently evolved forum of discussion and coordination, the Development Assistance Group.

Part II. Cooperation in Assistance to Less Developed Countries

A. PROGRESS TO DATE

1. Review of Findings and Conclusions

The United States has for many years pursued the policy of encouraging Free World industrialized countries to facilitate movements of private capital abroad and to supply public capital and technical assistance to less developed nations and, where appropriate, to join with the United States in continued efforts to build economic strength within a free society in the less developed nations.

The United States has consistently participated in joint assistance to the less developed countries through international organizations dealing with the economic development of such areas. Such multilateral activity is expanding in scope. An example of such a cooperative venture is the United Nations Special Fund, established in 1958 to assist less developed countries in planning and engineering the preliminary stages of development. The United States has also participated actively in the international financing agencies associated with the United Nations and in other regional organizations described later in this report.

U.S. bilateral assistance benefits directly from the multilateral examination of the economies and programs of the less-developed countries by international organizations in which the United States is an active member. The products of these reviews are important factors in

the level of United States assistance. The critical financial problems of Turkey and Spain, for example, were multilaterally discussed within the forum of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation prior to the development of plans for their resolution. On the basis of these discussions, the United States was able to develop more effective aid programs, taking into account multilateral and other types of assistance available to the countries under consideration. The annual Colombo Plan consultations on economic development problems and programs in South and Southeast Asia have also been useful in this respect.

With few exceptions, other industrial countries of the Free World have improved their financial positions and their relative competitive positions in the Free World have been restored. These countries could now, in the words of Secretary of the Treasury Anderson at the 1958 annual meetings of the Board of Governors of the IBRD [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development], IMF [International Monetary Fund] and IFC [International Finance Corporation],⁴ “face the common obligations to share in the task of providing capital to the less developed parts of the Free World.” Toward these ends, the U.S. is encouraging prospering industrialized nations to assume more substantial roles in fostering the advancement of less-developed areas.

There is today general recognition on the part of the Free World industrial nations that assistance to the less developed countries in their economic development is an imperative task which the industrialized nations must assume in their own interest.

Efforts so far have not been adequate to fill the requirements. The large and growing disparity of living standards in the less-developed countries, the rapid population growth in some of the less developed areas, the continuing technological revolution in the advanced countries, the continuing emergence of new nations with new expectations and aspirations indicate that a sustained and growing effort is needed for some time to come until at least some of the less-developed nations reach a level of self-generating growth.

Total government long-term loan and grant expenditures from the industrialized countries of the Free World to the less developed areas has increased substantially over the past few years. In the years 1954-1958 the flow of assistance is estimated to have averaged almost \$3 billion annually; in 1959 it was over \$4 billion, of which about 10 percent was disbursed through multilateral agencies.⁵ Of this total about two-thirds was contributed by the United States and one-third by the other Free World countries. The increase in these aid funds over the past few years was almost equally divided between contributions from the United States and from the other Free World industrialized countries.

It is reasonable to expect that the economic assistance expenditures of the Free World industrialized countries will continue to increase. Known commitments made by many of these countries in the last two years are likely

² For background, see BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 577.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Oct. 19, 1959, p. 531.

⁵ See table, p. 295.

to increase the rate of expenditures over the 1958-1959 level, and their announced budgetary plans suggest further increases. The recent establishment of new institutions, such as the Overseas Development Fund of the European Economic Community, the U.N. Special Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank, and the prospective establishment of the International Development Association will further increase the flow of capital and technical assistance to less-developed countries.

Economic assistance provided in the form of government-financed capital and technical aid is not the only measure to assist less-developed countries and should be viewed together with other policies, including efforts to encourage private investment and expanding world trade. But government-financed programs have special significance inasmuch as they do what other instruments of assistance cannot or will not undertake.

Capital requirements should not be viewed in quantitative terms alone. The effectiveness of capital can vary greatly depending on the proper combination of other factors of production. In fact, the improvement of technical and managerial skills, the improvement of government administration and development policies, and in general the creation of a social and cultural framework conducive to economic growth are of equal importance to investment and should also engage the ingenuity and determined effort of the developed nations.

Some of the methods and results of encouragement by the United States of other nations to increase their participation are described in the following pages. These include discussions with other industrialized nations on the problems of underdeveloped countries in order to increase the availability of funds for economic development. The United States has also encouraged the growth of international joint action in providing help to the less-developed countries and programs in which the underdeveloped countries themselves participate in assisting other less-developed countries. One of the objectives of the recently established Development Assistance Group, now comprising ten major capital exporting countries of the Free World and the European Economic Community, is to increase and improve the flow of capital assistance to less-developed countries.

There has been little or no overlap between the various bilateral programs and multilateral programs of the Free World countries. Except for the "ad hoc" multilateral assistance packages described in Section 3, below, however, it is not possible to assure complete and formal coordination of U.S. aid programs with each and every aid program of other countries as well as with the programs of international agencies. Nevertheless, the United States considers very carefully all known or expected activities in each country or region before formulating its programs, as described in the discussion below of the methods used by the United States in planning the kind and extent of United States economic activity abroad. Informal bilateral discussions continue to take place between the United States and other industrialized countries on behalf of the less-developed countries. The responsibility for the coordination of U.S. programs with those of multilateral organizations as well as with bi-

lateral programs of other nations, falls to a large extent upon the diplomatic missions and the U.S. Operations Missions. Cooperation is necessary to avoid duplication and overlapping, but even more to increase the effectiveness of the limited amounts of capital available for assistance to the less-developed countries. Development capital is still scarce in relation to the multitudinous requirements of the less-developed countries. The bulk of the assistance of other industrial nations has come from Western Europe and gone to the overseas countries where the United States has had few programs.

The task is great, the stakes high and of mutual concern to all Free World industrialized nations.

2. Coordination of U.S. Economic Assistance with Programs of Other Countries

In the preparation of the Mutual Security Program, the ability of other developed nations to finance an increasing share of the growing requirements of the less-developed countries has been taken into account. The United States has taken steps to encourage an increased level of aid from other countries.

U.S. Operations Missions abroad, in presenting the justification for an economic assistance program, evaluate in detail the role of external assistance in the economy of the cooperating country, including present and potential programs of other foreign governments and international organizations, potential investments of foreign business enterprises, and other forms of capital or technical assistance.

The purpose of such consideration is to provide the basis for an appraisal of the total external resources and techniques available to the country from all sources, in relation to the country's own material and human resources.

Bilateral discussions with other industrial countries are an increasingly important technique for coordinating economic assistance from the United States and other countries.

The U.S. has held informal talks, for example with the British regarding economic assistance programs to Libya and Jordan and with the British, French and Italians on Somalia. The United Kingdom continues to contribute to the support of the Jordanian budget, for example, and carries out economic development projects, particularly in the field of transportation. These efforts complement the ICA [International Cooperation Administration] program in Jordan which comprises technical assistance, special assistance in the form of budget support and economic development projects, and a PL 480 drought relief program.

Another example of cooperation in assistance is the continued provision by the United Kingdom of an annual cash grant of \$9.1 million to the Government of Libya for budgetary support.

There are numerous instances of cooperation between the United States and the metropolises on behalf of the economies of the newly emerging African States.

An example of industrial countries working together on behalf of the less-developed countries is the cooperation between ICA and the European Productivity Agency in the training of industrial technicians. Nearly a thousand participants from the less-developed countries have been

trained in Europe in the last year, and this program is being continued in FY 1961. The European Productivity Agency enlists the cooperation of the various national technical assistance bodies in Europe to arrange for the placement of participants in training institutions within their respective countries. All of the administrative costs incurred by these national technical assistance bodies are a contribution by the respective European countries. In addition, European countries bear roughly two-thirds of the cost of maintaining the European Productivity Agency's operating program.

Expected, if gradual, increases in bilateral assistance from other free world industrialized countries may not necessarily lead to decreases in the total U.S. assistance to the less-developed countries, although such decreases are likely in certain specific cases. Increased assistance from other free industrialized nations is needed in order to help meet the accelerated capital demands of the newly emerging nations and the increasingly concentrated requests from those less-developed countries which already have programs well underway and are able to undertake a more extensive program of capital development once financing is available.

3. *Ad Hoc Multilateral Cooperative Efforts*

One of the most significant developments in cooperation between industrialized countries and international institutions on behalf of the less-developed countries has been the conclusion, on an ad hoc basis, of several joint efforts providing for special or emergency assistance to individual countries. This method of international agreement to assist less-developed nations may be expected to continue to be used in the future as appropriate occasions arise. This method has, for example, been used to give assistance to Spain, Turkey and India, and is currently being used for the lower Mekong River Basin and the Indus Waters Project.

Spanish Stabilization Program: As the result of negotiations between the Spanish Government, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the United States Government and private banks in the United States, the Spanish Government last year was able to adopt an extensive internal monetary and price stabilization program. Funds were made available from the following sources: OEEC—standby credit of \$100 million; consolidation of bilateral debts with various European countries—\$45 million; IMF drawing rights—\$75 million; Export-Import Bank—standby credit of \$30 million; MSP [Mutual Security Program] Defense Support—\$45 million; PL 480 Title I Sales—approximately \$60 million; private banks of the United States—\$71 million credit.

Since the beginning of the program in July 1959 private bank credits have shown no net increase after substantial annual increases since 1954; the cost-of-living index has been stabilized; the budget deficit has been substantially reduced; Spain's gold and dollar reserves position has been improving steadily and the heavy balance of payments deficits on current and capital account were eliminated.

At the end of FY 1960 \$146 million of the international

credits provided for by the "stabilization aid package" remain to be drawn upon.

Turkey: Another example of cooperation was that which culminated in the announcement of the Turkish stabilization program on August 4, 1958. This program was supported by financial assistance in the amount of nearly \$360 million provided by credits of approximately \$100 million extended by members of the OEEC and the European Payments Union; \$234 million of loans, grants and sales of PL 480 commodities by the U.S. Government; and a drawing on the International Monetary Fund of \$32 million, half in U.S. dollars, and half in deutsche marks.

This stabilization assistance was the product of consultations in Ankara, Washington and Paris among senior officials of the United States, the OEEC member governments and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). It was designed to take into account the Turkish balance-of-payments situation and to enable the Turkish Government to carry into effect its stabilization program, including changes in the Turkish exchange system, with continued consultation with the IMF and the other governments concerned.

India: As a result of two IBRD-sponsored meetings held in FY 1959 to discuss ways and means of meeting the then-existing Indian financial crisis and assist India's economic development, loans were made to India by the U.K., the United States, Germany, Canada, and Japan as well as the IBRD. These loans helped India bring its deteriorating financial position under control. Since the first IBRD meeting in August 1958, a total assistance of \$717 million has been extended by the participating countries and the IBRD. This consisted of a \$35 million grant from Canada, and long term loans of \$175 million from the IBRD, \$79 million for Germany, \$153 million from the U.K., \$10 million from Japan and \$274 million from the United States (DLF [Development Loan Fund]). In addition, an Export-Import Bank loan of \$13.6 million was extended.

The PL 480 sales agreements with India are in addition to the above assistance. Agreements of September 1958 and August 1959 provided for sales totalling about \$560 million. The agreement, signed in May 1960, provides for the sale of \$1,276 million of wheat and rice (at U.S. export market prices), deliveries under which are to be made over a 4-year period.

Mekong River Basin: With the encouragement and assistance of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) the four countries of the lower Mekong River Basin, (Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand) have set up a coordinating committee for the investigation of the economic potential of the Mekong River Basin. Approximately \$6.5 million of support has been pledged to this program by eleven countries and eight U.N. organizations including the U.N. Special Fund. Its principal purpose is the collection of the necessary hydrographic, meteorologic, geologic, mapping and other data necessary for the efficient exploitation of the Mekong River Basin's resources. All contributions are coordinated through an executive agent for the Committee which is furnished by the United States.

The major donors are the United States and Canada.

who have offered \$2.2 and \$1.3 million respectively for establishing a system of hydrologic stations, surveys, and aerial mapping. France, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom are supplying equipment and boats; Australia, France, and Japan are assisting with certain surveys; India is furnishing rain gauges; Iran petroleum products; and Israel and China cement. The specialized agencies of the United Nations—ILO [International Labor Organization], FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization], UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization], WHO [World Health Organization], WMO [World Meteorological Organization], and IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] are making available the services of experts in their respective fields. The Special Fund has authorized \$1.3 million for assistance in assessing the development possibilities of four tributaries. The United Nations Technical Assistance Board is financing an advisory board.

The *Indus Basin Settlement Plan* is thus far the largest undertaking in which a number of countries have jointly planned to provide economic assistance to another nation.⁶ Basically, the plan provides for resolution of the long-standing dispute between India and Pakistan over the distribution of the waters of the Indus system in a manner which assures India the water required for extensive new developments such as the Rajasthan Desert and assures to Pakistan a continued water supply to the downstream irrigated areas. The system calls for a series of diversion and link canals and storage dams, with power development at the storage sites. It will also provide essential flood control.

The proposal was developed by the IBRD after years of study. The Bank's work has included not only development of the basic plan but also of the required engineering study and of a system of financing.

The cost of the Pakistan portion of the scheme is beyond that country's capacity to finance. IBRD has proposed that financial assistance for works in that country be provided by the Bank and by a group of friendly countries through a proposed Indus Basin Development Fund, to be administered by the Bank itself. Under the Bank plan, India and Pakistan would agree to a Waters Treaty governing settlement of the dispute between India and Pakistan on the Indus River System. Final agreement is expected in the near future.

The project is financed jointly by the IBRD, Australia, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States and by India and Pakistan. The total cost of the Indus Waters System, estimated at somewhat more than \$1 billion equivalent over a 10-year period, is planned to be financed as follows:

A. Contributors to Pakistan (through the Indus Basin Development Fund)

	Millions of dollars equivalents
1. Foreign Exchange Grants	
Australia.....	15.6
Canada.....	23.2
Germany.....	30.0

⁶ For background, see BULLETIN of Mar. 21, 1960, p. 442.

New Zealand.....	2.8
United Kingdom.....	58.4
United States.....	177.0
Total.....	307.0

2. Foreign Exchange Loans

U.S. Loan to Pakistan.....	70.0
IBRD Loan to Pakistan.....	80.0
Total.....	150.0

3. Local Currency

U.S. Loans and Grants	
Equivalent of U.S.	235.6

4. India and Pakistan..... See C, below

B. Contributors to India

1. Foreign Exchange Loans

United States.....	33.0
IBRD.....	23.0
Total.....	56.0

C. Contributions by India and Pakistan

These figures have been supplied to the Congress.

4. Cooperation Among the Less-Developed Countries Themselves

Cooperation among the less-developed countries may be expected to expand. Certain of the less-developed countries have taken the initiative in sharing their experience with others without waiting for full industrialization.

As a part of the technical cooperation program, a small but growing number of less-developed cooperating countries are participating with the United States in the support of training at "third country" facilities located within their territory. These third country facilities ordinarily provide training for participants from other less-developed countries in situations or problem areas akin to those actually experienced in their home countries.

Among the less-developed countries assisting in the third country training operations under the Mutual Security Program are Taiwan, Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, Ceylon, Israel, India, Iran, and Lebanon. Approximately 450 third country participants annually are now undergoing courses of study or receiving practical training in the lesser-developed countries named above. While the principal costs, such as tuition and per diem, are often paid out of the Mutual Security Act funds, the receiving or third country training countries are beginning to assume certain other costs which constitute a contribution to the training program.

Israel is playing an important role in extending technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia and, in order to operate these programs effectively, has recently established a Department for International Assistance and Cooperation under the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Assistance to the countries of Africa and Asia is centered in three main fields: (1) provision of Israeli experts, (2) the training of Africans and Asians in Israel, and (3) joint commercial enterprises.

Israeli technicians in various fields are serving in Ghana, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, French Sudan, Ethiopia, Burma, the Philippines, Cyprus, and Turkey. In addition, Nepal has recently expressed an interest in receiving technical assistance. These experts are sent at the request of the foreign governments to assist in projects connected with agricultural irrigation and water supply problems, medical, maritime and aviation services, housing, land resettlement, and business management. In most cases the expenses of technicians sent abroad are shared by Israel and the receiving country.

An outstanding example of cooperation involving the less-developed countries is the continuing tri-partite negotiations between the U.S. and India for the benefit of Nepal as the result of which India, out of its own internal resources, has given technical assistance to Nepal.

There are about 50 technicians in the Indian Aid Mission to Nepal. Major fields in the past have been construction of the Rajpath Highway into the capital city of Katmandu; and construction of the Katmandu Airfield. Technical assistance services have also been provided. Indian aid is generally provided within the framework of the Colombo Plan.

In an effort to assist Nepal in its five-year plan for economic development, India offered the rupee equivalent of \$26,000,000 for the years 1956-1961. These funds have been drawn down gradually for projects such as regional roads, village development, and Trisuli Power.

In addition 29 Nepali participants are receiving training in India particularly in the field of education.

On January 28, 1960, it was announced that India agreed to provide financial assistance of \$30,000,000 in rupees to assist Nepal over a five-year period. Of this, about a fourth is a carry-over from previous years. In addition, India has offered to construct the East Kosi Canal in eastern Nepal and continues to supply assistance to Nepal's military establishments.

There are many other examples of economic cooperation between the less-developed nations. Under the Colombo Plan for instance, the less-developed countries have given considerable training assistance to others. Burma has provided training facilities for trainees from Nepal, Thailand, and Sarawak. From the beginning of the Colombo Plan through FY 1959, Indonesia has provided training facilities to 85 students from countries which are members of the Plan; Ceylon has trained 53 foreign trainees in the fields of medicine and health, food and agriculture, engineering, transport and communications, public administration and co-operatives—and has assisted the Pakistan Government in coconut experimental work at its research station at Karachi, making available coconut seeds and seedlings at a low cost. India provided 1165 training places to students from other less-developed countries, mainly in agriculture, civil engineering, forestry, medicine, statistics, water resources development, poultry management, post and telegraph, community development and radio technology. The services of 26 Indian experts were also made available.

Burma, Sarawak and Singapore have utilized Colombo Plan fellowships offered by the Philippines in 1958-59, in malariaology, rural home extension and public admin-

istration. The Philippines continues to make other scholarships available for students from South and South-East Asia in education, social and cultural studies and various branches of engineering.

In 1958, a total of 153 trainees from Laos received training in Thailand under programs sponsored by the United Nations Specialized Agencies and various Colombo Plan countries. Such training programs continue.

B. NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN MULTILATERAL COOPERATION

As the problems of the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the economic strength of the industrialized nations of the Free World have been solved, the way has been opened for a new era of cooperation between these countries and the United States for assisting less-developed countries. To facilitate this effort there will have to be some adaptation of old institutions.

New institutions are being built on those existing institutions which have served the industrialized countries well in their past co-operative effort, which can continue to strengthen their economic ties and which can readily be adapted to the new tasks. Thus, last January, the United States proposed to the European countries belonging to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation that that body be reconstituted into an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Negotiations to that end are now in process. Meanwhile the Development Assistance Group has been formed, now comprising ten capital exporting countries plus the European Economic Community, which can make substantial economic assistance available to less-developed areas over and above their contributions to international organizations. As stated in the resolution which initiated the Development Assistance Group, the purpose of the Group is to discuss among its members the improvement of the flow of capital to less-developed areas. While the present Group is an interim organization, its task is expected to be incorporated under the OECD. The present membership of the Development Assistance Group includes Japan; this is in recognition of the important role Japan can play in capital exports to the less-developed countries, and also to indicate the global, as against the regional nature of the task of the cooperative developmental effort.

As with all new departures, the new organization faces a number of problems. These pertain primarily to the scope and nature of its functions, to its relation to other existing international organizations and to the relations with less-developed countries; these three problems are interrelated.

The rationale of the Development Assistance Group—and to some extent its future parent organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—is to provide a forum where the capital exporting countries can discuss among themselves the problems of economic assistance to less-developed countries in order to achieve a high degree of cooperation in this field. The Development Assistance Group is primarily concentrating on matters of broad policy, general principles and techniques which are of common interest to the capital exporting countries. These include such problems

as the ways and means of mobilizing capital flows to less-developed countries, the easing of terms under which capital is provided for development purposes, institutional arrangements, improvements in the procedures of information exchange, consultation and coordination. The Development Assistance Group has no operational functions, nor will it administer a fund.

The relationship of the Development Assistance Group to existing international organizations, to the less-developed countries or to their regional groupings evolves from its own function and terms of reference. By and large, it is an indirect relationship. From time to time the Group may directly consult on matters of general interest to such organizations as the various institutions of the U.N., including the IBRD, the IMF, and the various regional Economic Commissions. However, the Development Assistance Group will encourage cooperative efforts among its members, with or without the participation of existing international institutions, directed toward the development problems of a given country or region, possibly by recommending procedures on how such cooperative efforts may be initiated or implemented or by simply intensifying the informal contacts and mutual understanding among high level officials of its members and the managers of their aid administering institutions.

The nature and function of an institution such as the Development Assistance Group and the emerging OECD will have to evolve and grow on the basis of experience. In fact, a major role of the new institutions will be to develop a closer identity of interests among its members, a greater sense of shared responsibility and a greater sense of urgency for the tasks of the economic development of the less-developed areas of the world. There is no blueprint, no detailed prescription which at the outset of this new venture can establish firm rules on how these goals can best be achieved. The work program will have to evolve from the pragmatic experience which the industrialized nations of the Free World gain from working ever closer together.

Nor should the OECD and DAG be viewed as a radical departure from the existing and established channels of coordination and cooperation. They are not meant to replace any of the functions of these organizations or to overlap with their activities. The new organizations are simply filling a gap. As Sir Oliver Franks remarked in a recent speech:

"None of these discussions would get in the way of the proper work of the great existing agencies like the International Bank in their job of planning and lending resources entrusted to them. I speak of the necessary preliminaries which must be accomplished if the industrialized nations are to approach their task soundly and thereafter join in cooperation with the developing countries, often through the great distributing agencies, in working out the fruitful application of the available resources."

Ideally the OECD and the Development Assistance Group should complement and strengthen the existing institutions and there is every reason to expect that the appropriate relations and contacts will be worked out with all the important agencies and organizations dealing with the problem of economic development of the less-developed countries.

The improvement in the cooperative task of economic assistance to less-developed countries is not likely to be possible without special and persistent efforts to bring it about.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES BY CERTAIN INDUSTRIALIZED FREE-WORLD COUNTRIES¹

(Expenditures in millions of dollars)

Country	Annual average 1954-56	1957	1958	1959	Total 1954-59
Australia.....	23.7	34.3	41.5	34.7	181.6
Belgium.....	4.0	8.0	12.0	22.2	54.2
Canada.....	21.4	23.2	60.5	67.4	215.3
Denmark.....	0.2	0.5	0.7
France.....	481.4	857.1	754.6 ²	770.0	3825.9
Germany ³	3.0	33.5	107.1	124.9	274.5
Italy ³	5.5	7.6	10.2	38.6	72.9
Japan ³	11.4	3.0	3.0	13.0	53.2
Netherlands.....	19.5	24.7	22.9	26.9	133.0
New Zealand.....	3.3	5.8	3.0	4.6	23.3
Norway.....	1.0	0.9	1.5	0.7	6.1
Sweden.....	0.7	0.3	0.8	1.1	4.3
Switzerland.....	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
United Kingdom..	161.5	155.9	177.2	241.1	1058.7
	736.5	1154.4	1194.6	1345.8	5904.3
United States ⁴	1554.6	2417.0	2250.7	2694.0	12,025.5
Grand total (exclusive of reparations)	2291.1	3571.4	3445.3	4039.8	17,929.8

¹ Expenditures (grants and loans) during Fiscal Years of countries concerned.

² The apparent drop in French aid expenditures is largely accounted for by devaluations of the franc at the end of 1957 and 1958.

³ Not including reparations payments to less-developed countries. In the case of Germany, these have through 1959 amounted to about \$428.4 million. During the same period, Japanese reparations payments were \$204 million; in addition, the accumulated trade debt of Indonesia to Japan, totaling \$177 million, was cancelled in 1958 under the reparations agreement. Italian reparations payments have been \$181.3 million.

⁴ Including Mutual Security, Export-Import Bank and P.L. 480 expenditures.

Provisional Agenda of the Fifteenth Regular Session of the U.N. General Assembly¹

U.N. doc. A/4420 dated July 22

1. Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Peru.
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation.
3. Credentials of representatives to the fifteenth session of the General Assembly:
 - (a) Appointment of the Credentials Committee;
 - (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.
4. Election of the President.
5. Constitution of the Main Committees and election of officers.
6. Election of Vice-Presidents.
7. Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter.
8. Adoption of the agenda.
9. Opening of the general debate.
10. Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization.
11. Report of the Security Council.
12. Report of the Economic and Social Council.
13. Report of the Trusteeship Council.
14. Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.
15. Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council.
16. Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council.
17. Election of members of the International Court of Justice:
 - (a) Election of five members of the Court;
 - (b) Election of a member of the Court to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Sir Hersch Lauterpacht.
18. Appointment of the members of the Peace Observation Commission.
19. Election of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [decision of the General Assembly of 14 November 1958, see A/3987].
20. Admission of new Members to the United Nations.
21. The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [resolution 1455 (XIV) of 9 December 1959].
22. Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space [resolution 1472 A (XIV) of 12 December 1959].
23. Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council [resolution 1404 (XIV) of 25 November 1959].
24. Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation [resolution 1370 (XIV) of 17 November 1959].
25. Final report of the Secretary-General evaluating the Second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in relation to the holding of similar conferences in the future [resolution 1344 (XIII) of 13 December 1958].
26. Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949].
27. United Nations Emergency Force:
 - (a) Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force;
 - (b) Progress report on the Force.
28. Progress and operations of the Special Fund [resolution 1240 (XIII) of 14 October 1958, part B, para. 10].
29. Economic development of under-developed countries:
 - (a) International flow of private capital: report by the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council [resolution 1318 (XIII) of 12 December 1958];
 - (b) Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1424 (XIV) of 5 December 1959];
 - (c) Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report by the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council [resolution 1425 (XIV) of 5 December 1959];
 - (d) Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1421 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].
30. Programmes of technical assistance:
 - (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council [see resolution 1383 B (XIV) of 20 November 1959];
 - (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1385 (XIV) of 20 November 1959];
 - (c) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance [resolution 831 (IX) of 26 November 1954].
31. Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: report of the Economic and Social Council [resolutions 1414 (XIV) and 1415 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].
32. Question of assistance to Libya: report by the Secretary-General.

¹To convene at Headquarters, New York, on Sept. 20, 1960.

tary-General [resolution 1303 (XIII) of 10 December 1958].

33. Assistance to refugees:

- (a) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General on the World Refugee Year.

34. Draft International Covenants on Human Rights [resolution 1458 (XIV) of 10 December 1959].

35. Draft Convention on Freedom of Information [resolution 1459 (XIV) of 10 December 1959].

36. Draft Declaration on Freedom of Information [Economic and Social Council resolution 756 (XXIX) of 21 April 1960].

37. Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories:

- (a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter [resolution 1461 (XIV) of 12 December 1959];
- (b) Information on economic conditions;
- (c) Information on other conditions;
- (d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
- (e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1470 (XIV) of 12 December 1959].

38. Study of principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV) [resolution 1467 (XIV) of 12 December 1959].

39. Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1465 (XIV) of 12 December 1959].

40. Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1466 (XIV) of 12 December 1959].

41. Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1471 (XIV) of 12 December 1959].

42. Election to fill a vacancy in the membership of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

43. Question of South West Africa:

- (a) Report of the Committee on South West Africa [resolution 749 A (VIII) of 28 November 1953];
- (b) Report on negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa in accordance with

General Assembly resolution 1360 (XIV) [resolution 1360 (XIV) of 17 November 1959];

(c) Election of three members of the Committee on South West Africa [resolution 1061 (XI) of 26 February 1957].

44. Question of the future Western Samoa [Trusteeship Council resolution 2014 (XXVI) of 1 June 1960].

45. Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi [Trusteeship Council resolution 2018 (XXVI) of 30 June 1960].

46. Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1410 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].

47. Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1411 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].

48. Financial reports and accounts, and reports of the Board of Auditors:

- (a) United Nations (for the financial year ended 31 December 1959);
- (b) United Nations Children's Fund (for the financial year ended 31 December 1959);
- (c) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (for the financial year ended 31 December 1959);
- (d) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (for the financial year ended 31 December 1959);
- (e) United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (liquidation and final accounts).

49. Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1960.

50. Budget estimates for the financial year 1961.

51. Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly:

- (a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;
- (b) Committee on Contributions;
- (c) Board of Auditors;
- (d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointment made by the Secretary-General;
- (e) United Nations Administrative Tribunal.

52. Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions.

53. Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialized agencies of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account [resolution 519 A (VI) of 12 January 1952].

54. Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and with the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [resolution 1437 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].

55. Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds [resolution 1440 B (XIV) of 5 December 1959].

56. United Nations Library: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1354 (XIV) of 3 November 1959].
57. Construction of the United Nations building in Santiago, Chile: progress report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1407 (XIV) of 1 December 1959].
58. Organization and work of the Secretariat: report of the Committee of Experts appointed under General Assembly resolution 1446 (XIV) and provisional recommendations thereon by the Secretary-General [resolution 1446 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].
59. Public information activities of the United Nations: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1405 (XIV) of 1 December 1959].
60. Personnel questions:
 - (a) Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1436 (XIV) of 5 December 1959];
 - (b) Proportion of fixed-term staff;
 - (c) Other personnel questions.
61. United Nations International School: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1439 (XIV) of 5 December 1959].
62. Annual report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board.
63. Comprehensive review of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund [resolution 1310 (XIII) of 10 December 1958].
64. Proposed amendments to certain provisions of the Pension Scheme Regulations of the International Court of Justice [decision of the General Assembly of 1 December 1959, see A/4297, paras. 3 and 11].
65. Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twelfth session.
66. Question of the publication of a United Nations juridical yearbook: report by the Secretary-General [resolution 1451 (XIV) of 7 December 1959].
67. Disarmament and the situation with regard to the fulfilment of General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 on the question of disarmament [item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics].
68. The problem of the Austrian minority in Italy [item proposed by Austria].
69. Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests [item proposed by India].
70. Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: report by the Government of India [item proposed by India].
71. Treatment of people of Indo-Pakistan origin in the Union of South Africa [item proposed by Pakistan].
72. Question of Algeria [item proposed by Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic and Yemen].
73. Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa [item proposed by Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea,

Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen and Yugoslavia].

Current Treaty Actions

MULTILATERAL

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding airmail with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3, 1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202. Ratifications deposited: Italy, June 9, 1960; British Overseas Territories, including the colonies, protectorates, and territories under trusteeship, June 21, 1960.

BILATERAL

Brazil

Agreement extending the agreement of October 14, 1959 (TIAS 2475), relating to the cooperative vocational and industrial education program in Brazil. Effected by exchange of notes at Rio de Janeiro June 29, 1960. Entered into force June 29, 1960.

Cambodia

Agreement relating to the exchange of official publications. Effected by exchange of notes at Phnom Penh July 15, 1960. Entered into force July 15, 1960.

Colombia

Agreement amending the agreement of April 5 and 7, 1960 (TIAS 4464), for the loan of a destroyer to Colombia. Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá July 25, 1960. Entered into force July 25, 1960.

European Atomic Energy Community

Agreement additional to agreement of November 8, 1958 (TIAS 4173), for cooperation concerning peaceful uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force: July 25, 1960.

Italy

Agreement supplementing the memorandum of understanding of March 29, 1957 (TIAS 3924), regarding war-damage claims. Effected by exchange of notes at Rome July 12, 1960. Enters into force when the two Governments have notified each other that the formalities prescribed by their respective laws have been complied with.

Korea

Agreement amending the agreement of April 28, 1959 (TIAS 2059), for financing certain educational exchange programs. Effected by exchange of notes at Seoul June 30, 1960. Entered into force June 30, 1960.

Peru

Agreement amending the military aviation mission agreement of October 7, 1946, as extended (TIAS 1562 and 2395), the army mission agreement of September 4, 1956, as amended (TIAS 3636 and 3821), and the naval mission agreement of July 31, 1940, as extended (54 Stat. 2344, 58 Stat. 1220, TIAS 2504 and 3511). Effected by exchange of notes at Lima April 26, May 2, May 21, and July 15, 1960. Entered into force July 15, 1960.

August 22, 1960

Index

Vol. XLIII, No. 1104

Africa. Political Divisions of Africa (with map)	283
American Republics. Policy Toward American Republics Reaffirmed by United States	282
Congo, Republic of the. President Praises Ghana for Support of U.N. Assistance to the Congo (Eisenhower, Nkrumah)	287
Disarmament	
Exchange of Correspondence Between President and Mr. Eaton	273
U.S. Delegation to Conference on Disarmament Submits Report to Secretary Herter (text of report)	267
U.S. Welcomes August 15 Meeting of U.N. Disarmament Commission (Lodge)	274
Economic Affairs. 1960 Pacific Festival (text of proclamation)	288
Educational and Cultural Affairs. International Educational and Cultural Relations: The Boundaries of Action, Governmental and Private (Thayer)	278
Ghana. President Praises Ghana for Support of U.N. Assistance to the Congo (Eisenhower, Nkrumah)	287
International Information. 1960 Pacific Festival (text of proclamation)	288
International Organizations and Conferences. U.S. Delegation to Conference on Disarmament Submits Report to Secretary Herter (text of report)	267
Korea. President Sends Message to Korean Students	287
Mutual Security. Economic Assistance as a Cooperative Effort of the Free World (excerpt from report to the Congress)	289
Presidential Documents	
Exchange of Correspondence Between President and Mr. Eaton	273
1960 Pacific Festival	288
President Praises Ghana for Support of U.N. Assistance to the Congo	287
President Sends Message to Korean Students	287
Treaty Information. Current Treaty Actions	298

U.S.S.R.	
U.S. Repeats Demand for Release of RB-47 Officers Held by Soviets (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	274
United States Seeks Access to Francis Powers (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	276
United Nations	
President Praises Ghana for Support of U.N. Assistance to the Congo (Eisenhower, Nkrumah)	287
Provisional Agenda of the Fifteenth Regular Session of the U.N. General Assembly	296
U.S. Welcomes August 15 Meeting of U.N. Disarmament Commission (Lodge)	274
Name Index	
Eaton, Fredrick M	267, 273
Eisenhower, President	273, 287, 288
Lodge, Henry Cabot	274
Nkrumah, Kwame	287
Thayer, Robert H	278

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: August 1-7

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

No.	Date	Subject
424	8/1	Thayer: Harvard Summer School conference on aid to underdeveloped areas.
*425	8/3	Cultural exchange (Peru).
†426	8/4	Visit of Crown Prince and Crown Princess of Japan (rewrite).
427	8/4	Note to U.S.S.R. on RB-47.
*428	8/4	Designation of Berenson, USOM, Libya (biographic details).
†429	8/4	Amendment of air transport services agreement with Italy.
430	8/5	Report of delegation to 10-Nation Disarmament Committee.
431	8/4	Special report on aid to newly developing countries.
†432	8/5	U.S. document on Cuba released.
433	8/6	U.S.-U.S.S.R. correspondence on Francis Powers.
*434	8/6	Herter: death of Ambassador Karrick.

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE LESS DEVELOPED AREAS

The Communist economic offensive continued its rapid pace in 1959 and early 1960, not only reaching new levels for many of its activities but also expanding into new areas. Countries in Africa and Latin America became the focal points of major bloc efforts to establish beachheads in Western spheres of influence.

This new pamphlet, based on the most recent information available to the U.S. Government regarding the Communist program of economic penetration, brings up to date the Department of State study entitled *The Communist Economic Threat*, published in 1959. After an initial discussion of bloc economic policy in the less developed areas, the 38-page booklet describes the nature of the offensive, the trade drive, and the areas of concentration.

Publication 7020

20 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me copies of *Communist Economic Policy in the Less Developed Areas*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

VOID